

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

The Supreme Court of California reconvened in the courtroom of the Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California, on March 7, 2000, at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Chief Justice Ronald M. George, presiding, and Associate Justices Mosk, Kennard, Baxter, Werdegard, Chin, and Brown.

Officers present: Frederick K. Ohlrich, Clerk; and Harry Kinney, Supreme Court Marshal.

- S075342      In re Lucero L., A Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law  
-----  
San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency, Respondent  
v.  
Otilio L. et al., Appellants  
Cause called. Elic Anbar argued for Appellant Otilio L.  
Suzanne Evans argued for Appellant Yolanda E.  
Gary C. Seiser, Senior Deputy County Counsel, San Diego,  
opened argument for Respondent.  
Gary P. Gross, appearing for Amicus Curiae Deputy County  
Counsel, Los Angeles, continued argument for Respondent.  
Mr. Anbar replied.  
Cause submitted.
- S064870      Vickey Kraus et al., Respondents  
v.  
Trinity Management Services Incorporated et al., Appellants  
Cause called. Mukesh Advani opened argument for Appellants.  
William Stern, appearing for Amicus Curiae California Bankers  
Association et al., continued argument for Appellants.  
Susan M. Popik argued for Respondent.  
Mr. Advani replied.  
Cause submitted.

S071934 Rosalba Cortez, Appellant

v.

Purolator Air Filtration Products Company, Appellant

Cause called. Theresa M. Marchlewski opened argument for Appellant Purolator.

Morton Rosen continued argument for Appellant Purolator.

Brad Seligman, appearing for Amicus Curiae The Impact Fund, opened argument for Appellant Cortez.

Cameron M. Cunningham continued argument for Appellant Cortez.

Ms. Marchlewski replied.

Cause submitted.

Court recessed until 1:30 p.m. this date.

Court reconvened pursuant to recess.

Members of the Court and Officers present as first shown.

S073031 The People, Petitioner

v.

San Joaquin County Superior Court, Respondent

Jose Francisco Zamudio, Real Party in Interest

Cause called. David Wellenbrock, Deputy District Attorney San Joaquin County, opened argument for Petitioner.

Craig M. Holmes, Chief Deputy District Attorney San Joaquin County, continued argument for Petitioner.

Victor S. Haltom argued for Real Party in Interest.

Mr. Holmes replied.

Cause submitted.

S080451 The People, Respondent

v.

Juancho L. Rells, Appellant

Cause called. Robert Derham argued for Appellant.

Michael A. Katz, Deputy Attorney General, argued for Respondent.

Mr. Derham replied.

Cause submitted.

Court recessed until 9:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 8, 2000.

Orders were filed in the following matters extending the time within which to grant or deny a petition for review to and including the date indicated, or until review is either granted or denied:

- A083423/S084823    People v. Daniel Wayne Bryant Jr. – April 3, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 3, 2000, due to clerical error.
- B119634/S084898    People v. Nocholas Eck – April 5, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 6, 2000, due to clerical error.
- B121849/S084755    People v. Eddie Harris et al. - March 31, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 3, 2000, due to clerical error.
- B130777/S084944    People v. Bryan Toney – April 5, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 6, 2000, due to clerical error.
- D030559/S084783    People v. Gilbert Lopez – March 31, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 3, 2000, due to clerical error.
- E022135/S085033    Michael Dibble v. San Bernardino County Superior Court; Lewco Iron Works Inc. et al., RPI – April 5, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 3, 2000, due to clerical error.
- G020427/S084906    David Haproff v. General Motors Corp. et al. – April 6, 2000.
- G021862/S084888    People v. Thomas George Cargill – April 5, 2000. This order is entered nunc pro tunc as of March 6, 2000, due to clerical error.

S029384 People, Respondent

v.

Dannie Ray Hillhouse, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including March 31, 2000. In light of counsel's oral argument scheduled for the court's April calendar in *People v. Ayala* (case no. S009108), the court, if necessary, will entertain one more reasonable request for an extension of time to file the brief.

S030956 People, Respondent

v.

William James Ramos, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including April 5, 2000.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S044834 People, Respondent

v.

Raymond F. Johns, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including April 14, 2000, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S081791 Dana Zelig et al., Appellants

v.

County of Los Angeles et al., Respondents

On application of respondent County of Los Angeles, and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's opening brief on the merits is extended to and including March 4, 2000.

S083660      In re Wendell Harrison  
                         on  
                         Habeas Corpus

On application of the Attorney General and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including April 1, 2000.

S004725      People, Respondent  
                         v.  
                         Royal Kenneth Hayes, Appellant

In the above-entitled matter the court filed its decision on December 23, 1999, because of the following extraordinary and compelling circumstances:

1. The size of the record (the clerk's and reporter's transcripts totaling in excess of 20,000 pages).
2. The necessity to replace appellant's counsel who, after numerous continuances, failed to file Appellant's Opening Brief.
3. The number (thirty-three) and complexity of the issues and subissues.

S006547      People, Respondent  
                         v.  
                         David Joseph Carpenter, Appellant

In the above-entitled matter, the court filed its decision on November 29, 1999, because of the following circumstances:

1. The size of the record, which exceeded 30,000 pages total.
2. The necessity to grant appellant, for good cause shown, eight extensions of time within which to file the appellant's opening brief, and five extensions of time within which to file the reply brief.
3. The necessity to grant respondent, for good cause shown, four extensions of time within which to file the respondent's brief.
4. The number and complexity of the issues presented.